

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION No 151 of 1999

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

1 to 5 - No

-----  
PRANSHANKAR BHAISHANKAR DAVE

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

-----  
Appearance:

PARTY-IN-PERSON for Petitioner

MR KP RAVAL, APP for Respondent No. 1

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 11/03/99

ORAL JUDGEMENT

It seems from the record and proceedings that he has filed the complaint in the year 1994 which has been numbered as Inquiry Case No.5 of 1994. Till today, it has not been finally decided by the Court below. The petitioner party-in-person had preferred Cri. Misc. Appln.No.45 of 1998 before the Sessions Court for

transferring the original Inquiry Case No.5 of 1994 which has been rejected by the learned Sessions Judge on 22-2-1999 by directing the Court below to dispose of the matter as early as possible. Against that, petitioner party-in-person has preferred the present Criminal Revision Application mainly on the ground that it was not the prayer of the petitioner before the Court below that matter may be expedited, still the Court had expedited and, therefore, that part of the order is required to be treated as not legal and proper.

I have gone through the order passed by the Court and also gone through the Criminal Revision application. I have heard Mr.P.B.Dave, the party-in-person. Mr.K.P.Raval, learned APP appeared for the respondent-State. I do not find anything wrong in the order passed by the Court below in Cri. Misc.Appln.No.45 of 1998. The learned Sessions Judge has merely directed to dispose of the Inquiry Case No.5 of 1994 as early as possible. Therefore, I am of the opinion that that part of the order is not illegal in any circumstances of the case and learned Sessions Judge has rightly passed the said order. Even though this order is in favour of the present petitioner party-in-person, original complainant, he has preferred this Criminal Revision Application which is required to be rejected. Hence, it is rejected.

...  
radhan/